

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT  
DIVISION TWO

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ERIC DONELL CHASE,

Defendant and Appellant.

B268620

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. TA041199)

THE COURT:\*

In 1996, Eric Donell Chase was convicted of murder, attempted murder and shooting at an inhabited dwelling; various enhancements were found to be true. He was sentenced to 36 years to life for the murder, 20 years for the attempted murder and to a concurrent term on the remaining count. The court also imposed a restitution fine of \$10,000 under Penal Code section 1202.4, subdivision (f) to pay for the funeral expenses of the murder victim.<sup>1</sup>

---

\* BOREN, P.J.                      ASHMANN-GERST, J.                      HOFFSTADT, J.

<sup>1</sup> “Except as provided in subdivisions (q) and (r), in every case in which a victim has suffered economic loss as a result of the defendant’s conduct, the court shall require that the defendant make restitution to the victim or victims in an amount established by court order, based on the amount of loss claimed by the victim or victims or any other showing to the court.” (Pen. Code, § 1202.4, subd. (f).)

On October 13, 2015, Chase filed a motion to reduce the \$10,000 fine to \$200, principally on the ground that there was no showing that he had the ability to pay the larger fine. The superior court denied the motion, finding that Chase could pay the \$10,000 fine from his earnings in prison. Chase appealed from this order.

On February 11, 2016, appointed counsel filed a brief under *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, in which she requested this court to conduct an independent review of the record. Chase was notified that the brief filed by counsel did not raise any arguable issues and he was given an opportunity to file a brief in propria persona. He has not done so.

We have independently examined the record. We find that there are no arguable issues and that appointed counsel has discharged her responsibilities.

The judgment is affirmed.